

### **Remark**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 29, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43 and 50-56 have been amended. No Claims have been canceled. Therefore, claims 29-56 are now presented for examination.

### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner has noted a number of informalities in the claims. These are corrected as indicated by the Examiner. In the case of Claim 49, no change has been made. While the user interface of Claim 38 receives verbal instructions. In Claim 49, it also presents multimedia data. This may be done through a display, headphones or a variety of other components that may be a part of the user interface of Claims 38 and 49.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection**

*Barber et al in view of Miyazawa et al.*

Claims 29-32, 36, 38-40, 42, 44, 49 and 51-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Barber et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,240,521, ("Barber"), in view of Miyazawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,983,186, ("Miyazawa"). In Barber, two processors share "a common instruction set and address space." In Miyazawa, which is not relevant art to the present invention, a single CPU is used. If the input sound volume exceeds a level (s1), then the CPU is awakened (s2) to interpret the input sound. If Miyazawa were relevant art, then it might suggest interpreting verbal instructions, but not interpreting verbal instructions independent of the CPU.

Claim 29 recites interpreting verbal instructions from a user at a speech recognition unit of a low power subsystem. Neither reference shows a speech recognition unit other than a CPU, yet the speech recognition unit of Claim 29 is independent of the CPU.

Claim 29 also recites accessing data contained with the computer system memory through a shared database. In both references, there is no shared database. In Barber, both processors have the same memory, there is no separate computer system memory accessed through a shared database. In Miyazawa, there is only a single database and it is accessed by the single CPU, not by any separate speech recognition unit or processor.

Based on these distinctions, Claim 29 is believed to be distinguished over the cited combination. In addition, in the references there is nothing to suggest these distinctions, and accordingly, Claim 29 and the claims which depend therefrom are believed to be allowable.

Claim 38, like Claim 29 recites a speech recognition unit, a low power subsystem processor and a shared database through which access to the computer system is obtained. As mentioned above, these features are not shown in the cited combination.

Claim 51 is believed to be allowable on substantially the same grounds as Claims 29 and 38.

### **35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

The Examiner has made a number of rejections based on obviousness rejections using additional references. In the interests of conciseness after the final rejection, these rejections are not addressed. The additional rejections were not cited for and do not show

the elements missing from Barber and Miyazawa mentioned above. Any points made by the Examiner in this and other actions that are not addressed in this or other responses are not conceded by Applicant. The many other points are not addressed instead in an effort to ease the Examiner's workload and make it easier for the Examiner to consider the response.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

**Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

**Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: August 15, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon R. Lindeen III  
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980